



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/824,395

04/15/2004

Nongji Chen

1906-0133PUS1

6416

2292 7590 05/06/2009
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

DSOUZA, JOSEPH FRANCIS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/06/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/824,395	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner ADOLF DSOUZA	Art Unit 2611	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ADOLF DSOUZA. (3) ____.

(2) Chad Billings (Reg. No. 48,917). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 01 May 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: McCorkle et al (US 6,505,032).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (1) Applicant stated he would amend claim 1 to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection (2) Applicant stated that in the invention, the first and second signals are combined and the synchronization pulse is then generated from the combined signal, whereas in McCorkle the outputs of the parallel correlators are not combined. Examiner agreed to review McCorkle's column 10, lines 24 – 39 to better understand where the "coherent addition" was being done.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Adolf DSouza/ Examiner, Art Unit 2611	/David C. Payne/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611
---	--